

Posted: _____

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Kremmling Field Office
P.O. Box 68
Kremmling, CO 80459

DOCUMENTATION OF LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE AND NEPA ADEQUACY

NUMBER: CO-120-2007-38 DNA

PROJECT NAME: Mountain Parks Electric Grand View Amendment

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T. 1N., R. 78W., Section 8: NENW

APPLICANT: Mountain Parks Electric Assoc.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION: Mountain Parks Electric has applied for a right-of-way (ROW) amendment to install a guy wire on an existing pole and hang a powerline across BLM-administered public land to a pole on private property. The power would serve the Grand View subdivision. The line would be approximately 208 feet long. The guy wire would be placed 15 feet outside of the existing ROW width.

LAND USE PLAN (LUP) CONFORMANCE REVIEW: The Proposed Action is subject to the following plan:

Name of Plan: Kremmling Resource Management Plan (RMP), Record of Decision (ROD)

Date Approved: December 19, 1984; Updated February 1999

The Proposed Action is in conformance with the LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following RMP decision:

Decision Language: **12. Realty**, a. Objective *“Provide the opportunity to utilize public lands for development of facilities which benefit the public, while considering environmental and agency concerns.”*

REVIEW OF EXISTING NEPA DOCUMENTS:

List by name and date all existing NEPA documents that cover the Proposed Action.

Name of Document: Mt. Bross Communication Site and Powerline CO-120-04-03-EA

Date Approved: 12/12/2003

NEPA Adequacy Criteria	Yes	No
<p>1. Is the Proposed Action substantially the same action and at the site specifically analyzed in an existing document?</p> <p>Explanation: The analysis for a guy wire is close to the existing ROW as to be substantially the same action and at the site specifically analyzed in the existing environmental assessment (EA). The existing line also has guy wires on it.</p>	X	
<p>2. Was a reasonable range of alternatives to the Proposed Action analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s), and does that range and analysis appropriately consider current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?</p> <p>Explanation: The Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative were analyzed in the existing NEPA document. The analysis appropriately considers current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values.</p>	X	
<p>3. Does the information or circumstances upon which the existing NEPA document(s) are based remain valid and germane to the Proposed Action? Is the analysis still valid in light of new studies or resource assessment information?</p> <p>Explanation: There is no new information or circumstances that would invalidate the existing analyses.</p>	X	
<p>4. Does the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the Proposed Action?</p> <p>Explanation: The methodology and analytical approach used in the EA continues to be appropriate for the Proposed Action.</p>	X	
<p>5. Are the direct and indirect impacts that would result from implementation of the Proposed Action unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?</p> <p>Explanation: The EA analyzed the direct and indirect impacts that would result from the construction and maintenance of a powerline and remain unchanged for the Proposed Action.</p>	X	

6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the Proposed Action unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Explanation: The cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the Proposed Action remain unchanged.	X	
7. Is the public involvement and interagency review associated with the existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the Proposed Action? Explanation: There have been no additional issues, concerns, or controversies developed since the EA was written. The Proposed Action is listed on the Kremmling Field Office Internet NEPA Register and Public Room NEPA board notifying potential interested or affected publics.	X	

INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW:

Name	Title	Area of Responsibility	Date Review Completed
Susan Cassel	Realty Specialist	Lands	6/27/07
Joe Stout	Planning and Environmental Coord.	NEPA	7/5/07
Bill Wyatt	Archeologist	Cultural	6/26/07
Megan McGuire	Wildlife Biologist	T&E Species	6/26/07
Paula Belcher	Hydrologist	Soil, Air & Water	5/16/07
Richard Johnson	Rangeland Mgt Specialist	Invasive, Non-native Species, Vegetation, Range	5/18/07

REMARKS:

Cultural Resources: Cultural inventory report #CR-07-43 was completed for the undertaking. No sites or isolated finds were located. Thus, the project would be a no effect.

Native American Religious Concerns: No Native American concerns have been identified by those tribes that have been consulted for Traditional Cultural Properties as a result of the original EA.

Threatened and Endangered Species: There would be no impacts to threatened or endangered species.

COMPLIANCE PLAN: The right-of-way would be inspected and monitored periodically during terms of the grant to ensure compliance with the terms and conditions of the grant. The right-of-way would also be inspected after any maintenance activities to determine compliance with and effectiveness of reclamation measures.

NAME OF PREPARER: Susan Cassel

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR: Joe Stout

DATE: 7/5/07

ATTACHMENTS:

- 1). Project map
- 2). Standard realty stipulations included with rights-of-ways.

CONCLUSION

CO-120-2007-38-DNA

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the land use plan and that the NEPA documentation previously prepared fully covers the Proposed Action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

SIGNATURE OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL: /s/ David Stout

DATE SIGNED: 7/11/07

Note: The signed Conclusion on this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision.